



Co-management of climate extremes for agriculture resilience via innovative technologies for irrigation in S?o Tom? and Pr?ncipe

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10883

Countries

Sao Tome and Principe

Project Name

Co-management of climate extremes for agriculture resilience via innovative technologies for irrigation in S?o Tom? and Pr?ncipe

Agencies

AfDB

Date received by PM

3/12/2023

Review completed by PM

5/29/2024

Program Manager

Fareeha Iqbal

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

**PIF
CEO Endorsement**

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/3/2023:

Adjustment requested:

In the Project Objective, could you please change "resilience" to "climate resilience"? Thank you.

GEF SEC, 1/23/24:

Thank you. Please consider changing project title in the document.

GEF Sec, 5/31/24:

Adjustment is requested:

In the project information section, the project duration does not match the expected implementation start/completion dates. Please review and correct where necessary.

(Please note that the project title is adequate and does not need adjusting, as it includes reference to "climate extremes".)

Agency Response

AfDB 20/12/2023

We tried to change the title as requested but we couldn't change it on the GEF portal.

AfDB 30/04/2024

Project title was adjusted in the Word document as suggested 'Co-management of climate extremes for agriculture climate resilience in Sa?o Tome? and Pri?ncipe?'. However, the AfDB team responsible for GEF projects encountered difficulty to amend the project title while submitting the revised project in the Portal.

AfDB 05/06/2024

The expected implementation start and completion dates have been corrected to match the expected duration of the project.

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEF SEC, 4/7/23:

Yes.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GDEF SEC, 4/7/23:

No. Co-finance letters are missing.

GEF SEC, 1/23/24:
Co-finance letter submitted.

Agency Response
AfDB 19/01/2024

The co-financing letter has been uploaded to the Portal.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Please ensure the project budget table is included in Annex E of the Portal Entry. It is currently missing.

GEF SEC, 1/23/24:

Budget table is still missing in Annex E. Please address.

GEF Sec, 5/29/24:

Cleared.

Agency Response
AfDB 20/12/2023

The Budget table has been submitted at the GEF Portal entry together with the other project documents.

AfDB 30/04/2024

The Budget table has been re-submitted on the GEF Portal.

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF SEC, 4/7/23:

No.

Annex C on 'Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant' is missing.

GEF SEC, 1/23/24:

Annex C is still missing. Please address.

GEF Sec, 5/31/24:

Further information is requested.

In the table on the Status of Utilization of PPG: please provide additional details for the row on "Consultancy Preparation Contract".

Agency Response

AfDB 20/12/2023

Annex C has been completed.

AfDB 30/04/2024

Annex C on 'Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant' was now submitted.

AfDB 05/06/2024

Additional details were provided for the row "Consultancy Preparation Contract" in the PPG table.

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF SEC, 4/7/23:

Please discuss why there is such a high ratio of male to female beneficiaries. We aspire for gender equality in GEF projects.

GEF SEC, 1/23/24:

The ratio of male to female beneficiaries for the LDCF Core Indicator 1 is less than 40%.

Please revise as indicated in your response.

GEF Sec, 5/29/24:

Cleared. In future, please aspire for a 50/50 ration of men and women beneficiaries.

Agency Response

AfDB 20/12/2023

Ratio of male to female beneficiaries currently being considered in all project activities is 40% Please see Annex 7 with the Gender Assessment and Action Plan.

AfDB 30/04/2024

Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender

It is expected that the project will benefit 63,584 people (25,434 female), considering:

? 7,334 people (40% = 2,934 female) out of which 7,280 people benefiting from the implementation of climate resilient agriculture practices (including water storage, irrigation, agroforestry systems, restoration and capacity building related to the implemented technologies) and 54 technicians and extension officers directly benefiting from capacity building.

? 56,250 people made aware of climate change impacts and appropriate adaptation in STP (40% = 22,500 female).

Number of female beneficiaries was revised accordingly, both in the Core Indicators sheet and description of each one of the core Indicators in pages 5 and 6 of the Ceo Endorsement request form and in ?Annex F- CCA_results_framework_gef7-revMar24?

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Yes; this is well described.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Yes.

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Yes.

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Yes.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Review response is pending availability of co-finance letters.

GEF SEC, 1/23/24:

Yes, the grant contribution from the baseline project is clearly elaborated.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Yes.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Yes.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Yes.

GEF Sec, 5/31/2024:

Adjustment is requested:

In Annex D on Project Map and Coordinates, please consider inserting the geographic location of the site directly under the dedicated data entry field in the portal.

Agency Response

AfDB 05/06/2024

Geographical locations were inserted directly under the dedicated data entry field in the portal.

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Yes, a Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been uploaded.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Clarity is requested. Please discuss why, as per Core Indicator 1, a much higher ratio of men will directly benefit from this project than women.

A Gender Assessment and Action Plan has been uploaded. The project will engage in specific targeting of women in community-based water management committees and other mechanisms, as well as in community-level trainings; it will target female headed households for the construction and distribution of irrigation and water pumping kits, as appropriate; and engage in extensive gender-specific consultations with women organizations and communities to ensure the needs of women (and other vulnerable groups, such as people living with disabilities) are taken into account when deciding on the location, the process and the usage of water technologies.

GEF SEC, 1/23/24:

Please see comment above on core indicator 1

GEF Sec, 5/31/24:

Adjustments are requested:

- a) Please integrate gender considerations in Component 4 (in relevant outputs). On Outcomes 5.1 and 5.2, please ensure that gender equality considerations are captured.
- b) Please ensure that the Gender Action Plan is budgeted, monitored and regularly reported on.

(We note that the ratio has been adjusted to 40 percent for female beneficiaries, as per Agency explanation.)

Agency Response

AfDB 20/12/2023

A Gender assessment have been conducted during the project development exploring both, explicit and implicit gender and socioeconomic issues that could be addressed through the project components. The findings from the assessment also form the basis for the Gender

Action Plan, which will specify this GEF proposal's desired results, corresponding actions, indicators, timelines, responsible parties, and budget allocations, through the results framework. If implemented effectively, this project has the potential to become a good practice gender mainstreaming guide for future interventions in STP (nationally), in other SIDS and in sub-Saharan Africa (regionally), and globally. 40% of beneficiaries of the project activities will be female. Please see Annex 7 for the Gender Assessment and Action Plan.

AfDB 30/04/2023

In São Tomé and Príncipe, the percentage of female population is approximately 50.4% and it is considered that about 41% of adult women are heads of household. It would be suitable to have an equal rate of male and female beneficiaries, but according to the gender expert supporting the development of the Gender Assessment and Action Plan, based on the implementation experience and lessons learned from other projects, it is considered more realistic to target 40% (female headed households) of women participating and benefiting from the project activities than 50% (ratio male-female population in the country).

AfDB 05/06/2024

Adjustments were added in blue highlights under section (5 Additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the LDCF, and co-financing

a) The gender approach proposed in the Gender Assessment and Action Plan Annex were now also reflected in components 4 and 5 of the Project Description Section of the CEO Endorsement in blue highlights.

b) A specific budget for the Gender Action Plan is proposed in the Gender Assessment and Action Plan Annex (Annex 7, p.30) and gender responsive indicators that will be monitored and reported regularly are established for each output. For each gender responsive indicator, it is also established in the Gender Action Plan the mid-term and end-of-project targets along with means of verification and action points.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

No.

The Risk matrix needs to be provided in the Portal entry, identifying the range of potential risks and measures to mitigate them.

GEF SEC, 1/23/24:

Comment cleared.

Agency Response

AfDB 20/12/2023

Annex 8a- Environmental and Social Management Plan and Annex 8b- Full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment conducted by the Government of STP and the GEF Agency, including co-financed activities, have been provided through the Portal Entry.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

No.

This section is missing and needs to be provided. Please discuss (i) coordination with related GEF and non-GEF initiatives in the country and (ii) aspects of institutional and project-level coordination.

GEF SEC, 1/23/24:

The updated section on implementation arrangements is well noted. Comment cleared

Agency Response

AfDB 20/12/2023

The section on Implementation arrangements have been completed (please see Section 6). Additional information on complementarity and coordination with other GEF projects or bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area has also been presented in Annex 2.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Yes.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

No.

The environmental and social screening and assessment documentation has not yet been uploaded to the Documents section. The agency is requested to ensure that it also includes consideration of the risks posed by climate change to the envisioned project activities and outcomes.

GEF SEC, 1/23/24:

Yes, comment cleared

GEF Sec, 5/31/2024:

Further information is requested.

We note that the project overall ESS risk is classified as Moderate, and AfDB has attached the environmental and social safeguard documents as Annex 8a. However, although this is an environmental and social screening document, there is not much information about the

project's environmental and social impacts, since ESIA (Annex 8b) is not attached. Please attach the ESIA of the project (Annex 8b) in the Portal.

Agency Response

AfDB 20/12/2023

Risk matrix have been added for i) Risk to results, ii) Climate risks and iii) Environmental and social safeguards screening (please see Section 4). Annex 8a- Environmental and Social Management Plan and Annex 8b- Full Environmental and Social Impact Assessment conducted by the Government of STP and the GEF Agency, including co-financed activities, have been provided through the Portal Entry.

AfDB 05/06/2024

The ESIA (Annex 8b) was added and is attached in the Portal.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Yes.

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 5/31/24:

Adjustments are requested to the project budget:

- a. Please include the gender consultant in the category "local consultants" and not in "goods"
- b. The table is off margins. Please correct the format of the table or upload an excel sheet
- c. Please include a final line, in the table, with the total for each component

Agency Response

AfDB 20/12/2023

All Annexes have been completed and submitted through the Portal Entry.

AfDB 30/04/2023

Annex C was resubmitted.

AfDB 05/06/2024

a. The gender consultant was moved to the "local consultant" category as requested. b. The format was corrected. c. A final line with the total for each component was added in the budget table as requested.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Adjustments are needed.

Most of the "mid-term target" and "end of project target" values are missing from the table. Kindly complete the table.

GEF SEC, 1/23/24:

Comment cleared.

Agency Response

AfDB 20/12/2023

The project results framework has been completed. Please see Annex A.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Not yet. The comments provided during PIF review for consideration at CEO endorsement

are shown in the last row of the GEF Sec section of Annex B ("Additional comments"). The response column states this is "Work in progress".

GEF SEC, 1/23/24:

Comment cleared.

Agency Response

AfDB 20/12/2023

All comments received at the PIF phase have been answered to. Please see tables (a) and (b) in Annex B.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Cleared. No Council comments were received.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Yes.

Agency Response

AfDB 20/12/2023

All STAP comments received both, at PIF and Ceo Endorsement request phases, have been addressed.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

No. This is missing and needs to be submitted (as Annex C).

GEF SEC, 1/23/24:

Annex C is still missing. Please address

GEF Sec, 5/29/24:

Cleared.

Agency Response

AfDB 20/12/2023

Annex C has been completed with the information on status of PPG utilization.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

Yes.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

n/a

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEF Sec, 4/7/23:

No. Please address the review questions/comments. Also, several required items are missing in this submission, e.g., risk matrix, ESG assessment, PPG utilization table, project budget, cofinance letters, etc.

GEF SEC, 1/23/24:

Not yet. Please submit the missing items including the PPG utilization and project budget tables.

GEF Sec, 5/31/24:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments.

GEF Sec, 6/5/2024:

Please ensure all figures are displaying correctly in the Portal.

Review Dates

| | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| First Review | 4/7/2023 | 1/19/2024 |

| | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|---------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 1/24/2024 | 6/5/2024 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 5/29/2024 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 6/5/2024 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

COVER MEMO:

Sao Tome and Principe (STP) is an African LDC SIDS, with an agriculture sector that is highly vulnerable to adverse impacts of climate change include an extension of the dry season with risk of drought, as well as increased flood risk during the rainy season. Project areas identified (Cantagalo and Lobata districts in Sao Tome, as well as sites on Principe) have potential to grow a diverse range of crops including taro, banana, cocoa, manioc, corn, pumpkin, and other fruit and vegetables, the areas have been facing severe water constraints, exacerbated by climate change. The project will focus on delivering surface water storage technologies, groundwater storage technologies, measures to enhance soil moisture, technologies for efficient irrigation (e.g., off-grid PV pumps), and modeling and research to guide the design and location of the water harvesting and storage technologies. In addition, the project will improve rural roads to enhance producers' access to markets and train extension officers to support the development of farmers' business plans (especially women and youth). It will improve technical capacity across the water, agriculture and energy sectors, and build sub-national and local capacity, including community capacity, on climate change adaptation and water storage and harvesting technologies. It will directly benefit 63,584 people, manage 2,912 hectares of land in a more resilient manner, and train 2,238 people about climate risks and adaptation.